I oppose the industrial wind project "Pottinger" for the following reasons:

1. The “Project Need” as quoted by the proponent is based on faulty logic, reasoning and data. i.e. Net Zero and AEMO’s ISP, as is the section on “Justification and Evaluation” with reference to “anthropogenic climate change”.

   Many notable scientists, professors, engineers and energy industry experts agree that the Net Zero premises are false. These include, but are not limited to Prof. John Clauser, Prof. Richard Lindzen, Prof. Will Happer, Prof. Don Easterbrook, Prof. Willie Soon, Prof. Ian Plimer, Dr. Peter Ridd. However, these notable specialists are ignored and maligned by Government, the media and the renewables lobby, despite the mountain of evidence that they provide which indicates that the climate scare narrative is false.

   AEMO’s ISP is predicated on the idea that reducing emissions is a thing that needs to be done. It ignored options of building new coal or nuclear in determining what is says is the least cost pathway.

   Now that the Coalition has announced a nuclear policy, everything should be paused until after the pending election, as this project, along with every other wind and solar project in the REZ, would be then unnecessary.

2. The proponent’s statement “The Project will supply electricity to the national electricity grid via the existing electricity transmission network to power approximately 830,000 homes annually” is false and misleading. This is based on the wind turbines producing power 24/7 at full capacity. AEMO’s own data has shown that wind turbines only operate at around 30% of nameplate capacity, plus there is the loss of power through the transmission lines given the electricity is aimed at supporting cities, not the local population. If the generous 30% is applied to the proponent’s figures it reduces to 249,000 homes. Also consider that wind is intermittent and unreliable and such power will be at random times and sometimes not at all. It is very questionable whether such power should even be considered, when its very nature (reliant on the wind) is considered.

3. The people of the SW REZ were not asked and did not agree to be part of a renewable energy zone where their way of life will be substantially changed. As has been admitted in the CWO REZ where projects are more advanced, proponents and the government have admitted that the landscape will change from ‘rural agricultural’ to one that is ‘industrial’ in nature with wind, solar and HV transmission and associated infrastructure. Regardless of the government supposedly having

declared this SW REZ, the residents were never properly consulted and the decision was made by bureaucrats and politicians who were NOT representing their electorates.

4. I disagree that the project complies with "Ecologically Sustainable Development Principles". Wind turbines are certainly not ecologically sustainable when you consider the mining required for metal and materials, the manufacturing process, the shipping and overland transportation, the clearing of land for access roads and turbine pads and laydown areas, the blasting of bases and the amount of concrete and steel that goes into the base, the underground cabling plus of course the need for additional high voltage transmission infrastructure to connect them to the grid. None of these are ecologically sustainable and when looked at as a whole, are about as UNsustainable as you can get. Therefore, this justification is false and should be disregarded.

5. The project's boundaries are too close to Oolambeyan National Park and Booroorban State Forest. Oolambeyan National Park is recognised by the proponent at "known for birdwatching'. There are several vulnerable, BC Act and EPBC Act and migratory bird species identified by the proponent, which brings into question the potential for blade strike and the consequential loss of protected species' numbers to wind turbines. There is an attempt by the proponent to discount Oolambeyan National Park as it is at least 5km away, however for birdlife that FLY, 5 km is very close indeed therefore the aerial fauna will be under direct threat if they venture outside the park boundaries as they will do as they hunt and forage.

   Table 6-26 lists potentially impacted species from blade strike and the list is appalling. The collision risk does not specify if the projected collisions are for the whole 247 turbines or 1 turbine or an unknown quantity. This needs clarification. It is not acceptable to rely on inaccurate modelling in these cases as the viability of a species (or multiple species) may be negative affected and it is too late once these giant industrial wind turbines are already operating and kill count continues to rise. A "so sorry" from the proponent is inadequate in this situation. Buying biodiversity credits and offsets is also inadequate when the viability of a species locally could be affected.

   A 2004 study by Dr. Shawn Smallwood spanning four years, estimated that California's Altamont Pass wind "farm" killed an average of 116 Golden Eagles annually. This adds up to 2,900 dead eagles over a 25 years operation. Smallwood also estimated that Altamont killed an average of 300 red-tailed hawks, 333

American kestrels and 380 burrowing owls EVERY YEAR – plus even more non-raptors, including 2,526 rock doves and 2,557 western meadowlarks.

In 2012, breaking the European omerta on wind farm mortality, the Spanish Ornithological Society (SEO/Birdlife) reviewed actual carcass counts from 136 monitoring studies. They concluded that Spain's 18,000 wind turbines are killing 6-18 million birds and bats yearly. Extrapolating that and similar (little publicized) German and Swedish studies, 39,000 U.S. wind turbines would not be killing "only" 440,000 birds (USFWS, 2009) or "just" 573,000 birds and 888,000 bats (Smallwood, 2013), but 13-39 million birds and bats every year.

How many birds are these 247 giant 280m turbines, with tip speeds likely to surpass 200 meters per second, going to kill EVERY YEAR? This is NOT sustainable, particularly considering the cumulative impact of multiple wind projects in the SW REZ.

6. The proponent attempts some 'feel-good' vibes with the reference to naming their project after a local who was involved with windmills. Windmills are completely different beasts – windmills (when serviced) are silent and do not create blade pass harmonics unlike their wind turbine counterpart. Their size is minute in comparison to industrial wind turbines and they don't kill birds like industrial wind turbines that have a tip velocity of 200metres PER SECOND (based in a 15rpm turbine). Windmills are also placed atop a water aquifer and their purpose is to pump water from directly below to a nearby holding tank. Industrial wind turbines in this project are being placed hundreds of kilometres from their destination, requiring a spiderweb of high voltage transmission lines, substations, switching stations and more that will negatively affect property values, visual amenity and impact the agricultural activities on farms. I would assume the deceased Mr. Pottinger would be turning in his grave if he was aware of the damage that industrial wind turbines cause and his name being used in this manner.

7. Construction is estimated at 55 months – the construction period involves dramatic increases in OSOM vehicles, light vehicles and 900 workers which will disrupt the local area for almost FIVE years. No amount of 'community benefits' can negate that disruption to the community, the increased risks of travel with more vehicles on the road, the increased noise from traffic and construction and more.

8. Cumulative impacts need to consider not just the developments that will be visible with the naked eye (up to 25km away) but ALL projects within at least 100km of the project site. Given this project's geographical situation within the SW REZ, the WHOLE of the REZ in the next 20 years needs to be considered for cumulative impact, not just those projects that are currently published.

9. The proposed turbines are 280m tall. The tallest turbines currently being built in NSW is 250m. What exactly are the differences in noise, blade pass harmonics and amount of concrete required for the base between turbines 250m high and 280m high? Where is the data for these differences available to view?

10. The water requirements are extensive in a country that is more dry than wet. No groundwater or aquifer access should be allowed. Aquifer levels, dam water and creeks should be reserved for livestock, wildlife and domestic use.

11. The decommissioning and rehabilitation sections are light on detail and avoid any REAL responsibility for both, deferring decommissioning money to five years prior to the decommissioning date and rehabilitation "as far as practicable" with the plan to leave all underground cabling, cement etc., in situ "to avoid further environmental disturbance and minimise impact to revegetate areas, unless removal is requested by the landowner". This is unacceptable. Removal of underground infrastructure should be compulsory and not left at the whim of the landowner of the time, if any sort of return to agricultural purposes is planned for the land in the future. The land will be ripped and torn asunder to put all the cabling etc in. The land will then become compacted from use over the next thirty years and could certainly benefit from being ripped up again (with topsoil preserved and replaced). This should be not negotiable.

I reserve the right to add to my objection at a later point in time.

Annette Piper
21 June 2024